

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background

Education has often been seen as a fundamentally optimistic human endeavor characterized by aspirations for progress and betterment. It is understood by many to be a means of overcoming handicaps, achieving greater equality and acquiring wealth and social status. Education is perceived as a place where children can develop according to their unique needs and potential. It is also perceived as one of the best means of achieving greater social equality. Many would say that the purpose of education should be to develop every individual to their full potential and give them a chance to achieve as much in life as their natural abilities allow (meritocracy). Few would argue that any education system accomplishes this goal perfectly. Some take a particularly negative view, arguing that the education system is designed with the intention of causing the social reproduction of inequality. Historians have looked to ancient Greece as one of the origins of Western formal education. The Iliad and the Odyssey, epic poems attributed to Homer and written sometime in the 8th century BC, created a cultural tradition that gave the Greeks a sense of group identity. In their dramatic account of Greek struggles, Homer's epics served important educational purposes. The legendary Greek warriors depicted in Homer's work, such as Agamemnon, Odysseus, and Achilles, were heroes who served as models for the young Greeks , (Allen 1987).

Sociology of Education is one of the highest ranking education journals in the USA and nearly exclusively publishes research by sociologists of education. Thus, it can be said to reflect the "forefront of current sociological thinking about education in the USA" (Brint 2009:8). Articles (excluding special features, comments, and replies) were coded as international and comparative if they focused on one or more societies other than the USA. Case studies of a single society other than the USA, research comparing at least two societies (one of which could be the USA), and cross-national research comparing many nations were all coded as international and comparative, (Brint 2009).

Ancient Greece was divided into small and often competing city-states, or poleis, such as Athens, Sparta, and Thebes. Athens emphasized a humane and democratic society and education, but only about one-third of the people in Athens were free citizens. Slaves and residents from other countries or city-states made up the rest of the population. Only the sons of free citizens attended school. The Athenians believed a free man should have a liberal education in order to perform his civic duties and for his own personal development. The education of women depended upon the customs of the particular Greek city-state. In Athens, where women had no legal or economic rights, most women did not attend school. Some girls, however, were educated at home by tutors. Slaves and other noncitizens had either no formal education or very little. Sparta, the chief political enemy of Athens, was a dictatorship that used education for military training and drill. In contrast to Athens, Spartan girls received more schooling but it was almost exclusively athletic training to prepare them to be healthy mothers of future Spartan soldiers, (Allen 1987).

Sociology of education has been to understand how individuals come to be stratified in educational experiences and outcomes on the basis of class, gender, race, and immigrant status. A comparative lens illuminates how to overcome the course of educational expansion, some stratification trends have been marked by substantial change and fluidity, while others have remained remarkably constant. An ongoing challenge for sociologists of education and stratification is to make sense of these patterns and trends and explain why some forms of educational inequality are resistant to change while others are changing rapidly, (Brint 2009).

In the 400s BC, the Sophists, a group of wandering teachers, began to teach in Athens. The Sophists claimed that they could teach any subject or skill to anyone who wished to learn it. They specialized in teaching grammar, logic, and rhetoric, subjects that eventually formed the core of the liberal arts. The Sophists were more interested in preparing their students to argue persuasively and win arguments than in teaching principles of truth and morality. Unlike the Sophists, the Greek philosopher Socrates sought to discover and teach universal principles of truth, beauty, and goodness.

Socrates, who died in 399 BC, claimed that true knowledge existed within everyone and needed to be brought to consciousness. His educational method, called the Socratic Method, consisted of asking probing questions that forced his students to think deeply about the meaning of life, truth, and justice, (Allen 1987).

In 387 BC Plato, who had studied under Socrates, established a school in Athens called the Academy. Plato believed in an unchanging world of perfect ideas or universal concepts. He asserted that since true knowledge is the same in every place at every time, education, like truth, should be unchanging. Plato described his educational ideal in the Republic, one of the most notable works of Western philosophy. Plato's Republic describes a model society, or republic, ruled by highly intelligent philosopher-kings. Warriors make up the republic's second class of people. The lowest classes, the workers, provide food and the other products for all the people of the republic. In Plato's ideal educational system, each class would receive a different kind of instruction to prepare for their various roles in society, (Lampert 2003).

In 335 BC, Plato's student, Aristotle, founded his own school in Athens called the Lyceum. In the 4th century BC Greek orator Isocrates developed a method of education designed to prepare students to be competent orators who could serve as government officials. Isocrates's students studied rhetoric, politics, ethics, and history. They examined model orations and practiced public speaking. Isocrates's methods of education directly influenced such Roman educational theorists as Cicero and Quintilia, (Bernstein1987).

After primary and secondary school, wealthy young men often attended schools of rhetoric or oratory that prepared them to be leaders in government and administration. Cicero, a 1st century BC Roman senator, combined Greek and Roman ideas on how to educate orators in his book *De Oratore*. Like Isocrates, Cicero believed orators should be educated in liberal arts subjects such as grammar, rhetoric, logic, mathematics, and astronomy. He also asserted that they should study ethics, military science, natural science, geography, history, and law. From the 5th to the 15th century, Western society and education were heavily shaped by Christianity, particularly the Roman Catholic Church. The Church operated parish, chapel, and monastery schools at the elementary

level. Schools in monasteries and cathedrals offered secondary education. Much of the teaching in these schools was directed at learning Latin, the old Roman language used by the church in its ceremonies and teachings, (Allen 1987).

Schools were attended primarily by persons planning to enter religious life such as priests, monks, or nuns. The vast majority of people were serfs who served as agricultural workers on the estates of feudal lords. The serfs, who did not attend school, were generally illiterate. In the 10th and early 11th centuries, Arabic learning had a pronounced influence on Western education. From contact with Arab scholars in North Africa and Spain, Western educators learned new ways of thinking about mathematics, natural science, medicine, and philosophy. The Arabic number system was especially important, and became the foundation of Western arithmetic. Arab scholars also preserved and translated into Arabic the works of such influential Greek scholars as Aristotle, Euclid, Galen, and Ptolemy. Because many of these works had disappeared from Europe by the Middle Ages, they might have been lost forever if Arab scholars such as Avicenna and Averroes had not preserved them, (Serfdom 1952).

The invention of the printing press in the mid-15th century made books more widely available and increased literacy rates for example, Printing, producing books etc. But school attendance did not increase greatly during the Renaissance. Elementary schools educated middle-class children while lower-class children received little, if any, formal schooling. Children of the nobility and upper classes attended humanist secondary schools. Educational opportunities for women improved slightly during the Renaissance, especially for the upper classes. Some girls from wealthy families attended schools of the royal court or received private lessons at home. The curriculum studied by young women was still based on the belief that only certain subjects, such as art, music, needlework, dancing, and poetry, were suited for females. For working-class girls, especially rural peasants, education was still limited to training in household duties such as cooking and sewing, (Allen 1987).

In the 11th century medieval scholars developed Scholasticism, a philosophical and educational movement that used both human reason and revelations from the Bible.

Upon encountering the works of Aristotle and other Greek philosophers from Arab scholars, the Scholastics attempted to reconcile Christian theology with Greek philosophy. Scholasticism reached its high point in the *Summa Theologiae* of Saint Thomas Aquinas, a 13th century Dominican theologian who taught at the University of Paris. Aquinas reconciled the authority of religious faith, represented by the Scriptures, with Greek reason, represented by Aristotle. Aquinas described the teacher's vocation as one that combines faith, love, and learning. The famous European universities of Paris, Salerno, Bologna, Oxford, Cambridge, and Padua grew out of the Scholastics-led intellectual revival of the 12th and 13th centuries. The Renaissance, or rebirth of learning, began in Europe in the 14th century and reached its height in the 15th century. Scholars became more interested in the humanist features—that is, the secular or worldly rather than the religious aspects—of the Greek and Latin classics. Humanist educators found their models of literary style in the classics. The Renaissance was a particularly powerful force in Italy, most notably in art, literature, and architecture. In literature, the works of such Italian writers as Dante Aleghieri, Petrarch, and Giovanni Boccaccio became especially important, (Serfdom 1952).

Martin Luther believed the state, family, and school, along with the church, were leaders of the Reformation. Since the family shaped children's character, Luther encouraged parents to teach their children reading and religion. Each family should pray together, read the Bible, study the catechism, and practice a useful trade. Luther believed that government should assist schools in educating literate, productive, and religious citizens. One of Luther's colleagues, German religious reformer Melancthon, wrote the school code for the German region of Württemberg, which became a model for other regions of Germany and influenced education throughout Europe. According to this code, the government was responsible for supervising schools and licensing teachers. (Martin Luther 1968).

Educators of the 17th century developed new ways of thinking about education. Czech education reformer Jan Komensky, known as Comenius, was particularly influential. A bishop of the Moravian Church, Comenius escaped religious persecution by taking refuge in Poland, Hungary, Sweden, and The Netherlands. He created a new

educational philosophy called Pansophism, or universal knowledge, designed to bring about worldwide understanding and peace. Comenius advised teachers to use children's senses rather than memorization in instruction. To make learning interesting for children, he wrote *The Gate of Tongues Unlocked* (1631), a book for teaching Latin in the student's own language. He also wrote *Orbis Sensualium Pictus* (1658; *The Visible World in Pictures*, 1659) consisting of illustrations that labeled objects in both their Latin and vernacular names. It was one of the first illustrated books written especially for children, (Allen 1987).

The work of English philosopher John Locke influenced education in Britain and North America. Locke examined how people acquire ideas in *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690). He asserted that at birth the human mind is a blank slate, or *tabula rasa*, and empty of ideas. We acquire knowledge, he argued, from the information about the objects in the world that our senses bring to us. We begin with simple ideas and then combine them into more complex ones, (Meigham 1997).

Locke believed that individuals acquire knowledge most easily when they first consider simple ideas and then gradually combine them into more complex ones. In *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* (1697), Locke recommended practical learning to prepare people to manage their social, economic, and political affairs efficiently. He believed that a sound education began in early childhood and insisted that the teaching of reading, writing, and arithmetic be gradual and cumulative. Locke's curriculum included conversational learning of foreign languages, especially French, mathematics, history, physical education, and games, (Schofield 1999).

The Age of Enlightenment in the 18th century produced important changes in education and educational theory. During the Enlightenment, also called the Age of Reason, educators believed people could improve their lives and society by using their reason, their powers of critical thinking. The Enlightenment's ideas had a significant impact on the American Revolution (1775-1783) and early educational policy in the United States. In particular, American philosopher and scientist Benjamin Franklin emphasized the value of utilitarian and scientific education in American schools. Thomas Jefferson, the

third president of the United States, stressed the importance of civic education to the citizens of a democratic nation. The Enlightenment principles that considered education as an instrument of social reform and improvement remain fundamental characteristics of American education policy, (Harper 1997).

The foundations of modern education were established in the 19th century. Swiss educator Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, inspired by the work of French philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau, developed an educational method based on the natural world and the senses. Pestalozzi established schools in Switzerland and Germany to educate children and train teachers. He affirmed that schools should resemble secure and loving homes, (Lampert 1978).

Like Locke and Rousseau, Pestalozzi believed that thought began with sensation and that teaching should use the senses. Holding that children should study the objects in their natural environment, Pestalozzi developed a so-called “object lesson” that involved exercises in learning form, number, and language. Pupils determined and traced an object’s form, counted objects, and named them. Students progressed from these lessons to exercises in drawing, writing, adding, subtracting, multiplying, dividing, and reading. Pestalozzi employed the following principles in teaching: (1) begin with the concrete object before introducing abstract concepts; (2) begin with the immediate environment before dealing with what is distant and remote; (3) begin with easy exercises before introducing complex ones; and (4) always proceed gradually, cumulatively, and slowly. American educator Henry Barnard, the first U.S. Commissioner of Education, introduced Pestalozzi’s ideas to the United States in the late 19th century. Barnard also worked for the establishment of free public high schools for students of all classes of American society. (Allen 1987).

German philosopher Johann Herbart emphasized moral education and designed a highly structured teaching technique. Maintaining that education’s primary goal is moral development, Herbart claimed good character rested on knowledge while misconduct resulted from an inadequate education. Knowledge, he said, should create an “appreciative mass”—a network of ideas—in a person’s mind to which new ideas can

be added. He wanted to include history, geography, and literature in the school curriculum as well as reading, writing, and arithmetic. Based on his work, Herbart's followers designed a five-step teaching method: (1) prepare the pupils to be ready for the new lesson, (2) present the new lesson, (3) associate the new lesson with ideas studied earlier, (4) use examples to illustrate the lesson's major points, and (5) test pupils to ensure they had learned the new lesson, (Freire 2000).

German educator Friedrich Froebel created the earliest kindergarten, a form of preschool education that literally means "child's garden" in German. Froebel, who had an unhappy childhood, urged teachers to think back to their own childhoods to find insights they could use in their teaching. Froebel studied at Pestalozzi's institute in Overdone, Switzerland, from 1808 to 1810. While agreeing with Pestalozzi's emphasis on the natural world, a kindly school atmosphere, and the object lesson, Froebel felt that Pestalozzi's method was not philosophical enough. Froebel believed that every child's inner self contained a spiritual essence—a spark of divine energy—that enabled a child to learn independently, (Allen 1987).

In 1837 Froebel opened a kindergarten in Brandenburg with a curriculum that featured songs, stories, games, gifts, and occupations. The songs and stories stimulated the imaginations of children and introduced them to folk heroes and cultural values. Games developed children's social and physical skills. By playing with each other, children learned to participate in a group. Froebel's gifts, including such objects as spheres, cubes, and cylinders, were designed to enable the child to understand the concept that the object represented. Occupations consisted of materials children could use in building activities. For example, clay, sand, cardboard, and sticks etc. could be used to build castles, cities, and mountains, (Collins 1998).

British sociologist Herbert Spencer strongly influenced education in the mid-19th century with social theories based on the theory of evolution developed by British naturalist Charles Darwin. Spencer revised Darwin's biological theory into social Darwinism, a body of ideas that applied the theory of evolution to society, politics, the economy, and education. Spencer maintained that in modern industrialized societies, as



in earlier simpler societies, the “fittest” individuals of each generation survived because they were intelligent and adaptable. Competition caused the brightest and strongest individuals to climb to the top of the society. Urging unlimited competition, Spencer wanted government to restrict its activities to the bare minimum. He opposed public schools, claiming that they would create a monopoly for mediocrity by catering to students of low ability. He wanted private schools to compete against each other in trying to attract the brightest students and most capable teachers. Spencer’s social Darwinism became very popular in the last half of the 19th century when industrialization was changing American and Western European societies, (Allen 1987).

The most influential of all the followers of Rousseau was the Swiss educator Johann Pestalozzi, whose ideas and practices influenced schools on every continent. The principal aim of Pestalozzi was to adapt the method of teaching to the natural development of the child. To attain this objective, he worked towards the harmonious development of all the faculties (head, heart, and hand) of the learner. Among the other influential educators of the 19th century were Friedrich Froebel of Germany, the father of the kindergarten; Johann Herbart, also of Germany, who introduced the principles of psychology and philosophy into the science of education; Horace Mann and Henry Barnard, the foremost American educators, who brought to the United States the doctrines of Pestalozzi and other European educators; the British philosopher Herbert Spencer, who advocated scientific knowledge as the most important subject matter to be taught in school; and Bishop Nikolai Grundtvig of Denmark, whose educational ideas became the basis for the folk high school movement. Public education grew in the 19th century from nationalistic, as well as religious, motivation. The Prussian Law of 1810 was a reaction against the country’s military defeat by France, led by Napoleon, and provided for state secondary schools (Gymnasiums) as well as primary education. Other countries also set up state primary schools or gave public financial aid to church schools in the early 19th century, including Denmark in 1807 as well as France and England and Wales in the 1830s, (Allen 1987).

At the beginning of the 20th century, education was greatly influenced by the writings of the Swedish feminist and educator Ellen Key. Her book *The Century of the Child* (1900) was translated into many languages and inspired progressive educators in various countries. Progressive education was a system of teaching based on the needs and potentials of the child, rather than on the needs of society or the precepts of religion, where there is an ample amount of interaction between students and teachers, (Bernstein 1974).

The researcher has attempted to study sociology of education. It is the study of how public institutions and individual experiences affect education and its outcomes. It is most concerned with the public schooling systems of modern industrial societies, including the expansion of higher, further, adult, and continuing education.

Class room interaction is the systematic observation of a set of procedures. It uses a system of categories to encode and quantifies classroom behavior of teacher and students. The systematic observation represents a useful means of identifying, studying, classifying and measuring specific variables as they interact within instructional learning situation. The purpose of developing the observational system is that a teacher can be trained to use them for analyzing classroom behavior and for planning and studying his own teaching activities. The major indicator of interaction analysis is the coding and the decoding of communication by means of the use linguistic utterances or exchanges of language function.

The students of these schools are from various socio-economic and cultural backgrounds. Ethnic variable is also major ones. They represent Bramhans Chhetris, Janjatis and so called Dalits. They are from different linguistic background as well. Most of the students have their native language Newari and Tamang. Nepali is their second only a few students use Nepali as their native language. However, children from Brahman Chhetri community speak Nepali as their Native language. On this background, this study has been carried out. Hopefully, this study can be a masterpiece in the field of sociology of education. Yet, it has a wide room to study for future generations on issues like this.

## 1.2 Statement of the Problem

The history of Sociology/Anthropology is not old one. It began from early 1950s and arrives systematically in Nepal after a couple of decades. Similar is the case of Sociology of education. It has been organized as a separate discipline since 1960s. Quantitatively, a few studies have been done under this area. This particular research has been prepared to seek a new knowledge on student teachers interactions. Hopefully, it will aid some new knowledge on teaching and learning.

What might the sociology of education contribute to our broader understanding of crucial issues related to schools and education? Is it viewed from the perspective of someone who is not directly involved in that field but still interested in these matters? Much of researches in recent years have focused in the sociology of education, and have brought those concerns to the present question. When we survey the sociology of education, it seems that the field could improve its research in various areas of student teachers behaviors and their interactions. Does it cover these areas?

Sociology of education is the study of how public institutions and individual experiences affect education and its outcomes. It is most concerned with the public schooling systems of modern industrial societies including the expansion of higher, further, adult, and continuing education. ([www. sociologyofeducation.com](http://www.sociologyofeducation.com) Wikipedia the First paragraph.) What does the present Nepalese context of teacher pupil interaction look like?

The study of interaction among students and teachers is an ever raised issue in the field of education. Historically, Banking Approach of interaction was honored in education. This approach conceives that teacher is only the source from where knowledge can be generated. Students are believed only as an account holder in the bank. They have to take everything to be granted whatever the teacher orders them. How far the situation is altered at present? Is interaction influenced by such feelings or not?

This particular research topic could possibly be new one because it will aid on the theory of nature of interaction between students and teachers. Various national and

international conferences on education focus on child-friendly learning environment. This research seeks what is the students' good performance of result of? Is it the result of proper counseling and guidance provided to students by interaction? To say it other ways, is it because of enough interaction, discussions etc. between students and teachers?

This study is concerned with how students are given feedback when they raise some problems with teachers? Traditionally, the nature of interaction was one sided; the teachers communicate oneself and don't let students speak. Students' Talking Time (STT) in the class used to be nullified. If a student speaks and or raises a question, he was conceived as 'Manner less' or taboo. More rigid the teacher, better he used to be conceived (Freire1970). However, as the time passes by, students expose their feelings, raise questions and help students to cope it with up. In those cases, students used to keep their feeling depressed inside their heart. The situation is somehow different these days even on the part of the teachers, too. Teachers have begun to provide students the respect to their say. Thus, to find whether it is so, the research will be problematic one. This research will be problematic because it will seek the social value of interaction between students and teachers. The research will examine the mode of communication, i.e. whether they communicate face to face or with the use of devices of communication, such as mobiles, email or internet. The drawback of education is the lack of proper communication. This research, therefore, will aid on new knowledge.

### **1.3 Objectives of the Study**

In general, this study aims at analyzing the nature of interaction between students and teachers of two schools a private boarding and a community public school. Specifically, this study has following objectives:

- a) to explore the present situation of verbal interaction between students and teachers both in and outside the classroom of Chautara VDC of Sindhupalchok;
- b) to assess the causes of change in student teacher interaction.

## **1.4 Significance of Study**

This study has significances both in theoretical as well as in applied level. It may add new knowledge under the broad heading 'Sociology of Education'. In an applied level, it could be useful both for teachers and educators. It is an attempt to expose what sort of interaction trend is prevailed at schools and how it's being changed day by day.

Education plays a key role to the development of the nation. A country can't run its progress smoothly unless education is in favor of learners. It is a determinant of progress and key to economic development. From sociological prospective, education is viewed as an agent to social interaction and ultimately an indicator of social progress. Thus a study of interaction between students and teachers under the broad heading, sociology of education can be a contribution in social science.

Similarly, this study is fundamentally a creative task. Basing on empirical data, the study explains the nature of interaction between teachers and students. Thus, it concentrates on what the present condition of interaction is there in both private and public schools. It shows how often interaction takes place, what the venue is and what challenges encounter during interaction. Equally, it also tries to explain some changes being taken place in the field of interaction. Therefore, it remains an asset in the field of sociology of education. Additionally, the study aids some useful hints teaching practitioners and even to guardians. It could also assist curriculum designers as well as teaching materials developers, too. To be precise, this research could be an important document for studying teacher pupil interaction in future.

## **1.5 Organization of the Study**

This study is divided into seven different chapters. The first chapter deals with introductory part. Under it, the subtopics like background of the study, statement of the problem, its objectives, significance and organizational structures are dealt with.

The second chapter deals with the knowledge of concerned topics or related ones in the same fields i.e. the review of related literature. Specifically, it attempts to explore the concept and themes and followed by the review of empirical studies conducted so far. The third chapter deals with the research methodology. It discusses with the structure of study, significance of the selection of topics, sampling procedure sources of data collection, method of data collection, analysis interpretation and finally, the limitations of study. Fourth chapter concentrates on the analysis and interpretation like, general introduction of the study area, its educational, social, linguistic, ethnic background and all .Fifthly, teachers' and students' perspective on interaction and the venue where interaction takes place is analyzed. In unit six, overview of history to present context of interaction is dealt with. This unit attempts to analyze teachers related, students related and other challenges of interaction are dealt with. Finally, unit seven concentrates itself on summary, conclusion and recommendations of the study. Finally questionnaire and different pictorial representations will be mentioned.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Nepal is a fertile land for sociological /Anthropological research. Even of this branch of knowledge is novice here, a lot of studies have been conducted. It has also incorporated various sub- branches such as sociology of education, sociology of tourism, urban sociology etc.

In a Global perspective, early 1940s was an eve for sociological research. Compte Spenser, Martindole, Talcott, Durkhem, Maloneskey etc. have aided a lot in this field, particularly in structural functionalism. Similarly, Karl Marx's dialectical Materialsism aided ne more knowledge in this field, particularly in sociao-economic view. Clifford Geertz (1960) has clearly shown that symbols are reflected in everyday customs and behaviors of a member of the society.

After all, Globalization has made the world a small place. With the innovation of science and technology, everything can be learnt easily. New knowledge in every field is like and open book; everybody can ready and react with a click of a button of a computer. Of course, it has made researchers easier to accomplish their tasks in an easy manner. I have utilized the main source of knowledge as internet.

Since the early 1950s a number of researches have focused their attention on students-teachers' interaction in the class room. Bales (1950), an early observer small group interaction described interaction as “resulting when two or more persons behave overtly toward one another so that each receives some impressions or perception of the other distinct enough to incur reactions”. This study observed the behavior of pupil and teachers during class room interaction. The study summarized the teaching patterns achievement, perceptions, and personality of both teachers and pupils during the interaction, Bales (1950).

Three major categories affect student teachers interactions. They are: (a) pedagogical moves, such as structuring, soliciting, responding reacting; (b) content analysis, such as substantive, substantive- logical, instructional, instructional- logical and (c) emotional

meanings that comprises of valence, potency and activity, (Gallagher and Aschner, (1963).

A systematic sociology of education began with Émile Durkheim's work on moral education as a basis for organic solidarity and that by Max Weber, on the Chinese literati as an instrument of political control. It was after World War II, however, that the subject received renewed interest around the world: from technological functionalism in the US, egalitarian reform of opportunity in Europe, and human-capital theory in economics. These all implied that, with industrialization, the need for a technologically skilled labor force undermines class distinctions and other restrictive systems of stratification, and that education promotes social mobility. However, statistical and field research across numerous societies showed a persistent link between an individual's social class and achievement, and suggested that education could only achieve limited social mobility. Sociological studies showed how schooling patterns reflected, rather than challenged, class stratification and racial and sexual discrimination. After the general collapse of functionalism from the late 1960s onwards, the idea of education as an unmitigated good was even more profoundly challenged. Neo-Marxists argued that school education simply produced a docile labor-force essential to late-capitalist class relations, (Marx 1848) .

When we talk about domestic research trends of Nepal, Mr. G.S. Nepalis' *The Newars* (1995) appears to be the most important one; where he has studied in detail what their ethnographic behaviour is all about. It has also contributed to see the educational perspectives being influenced by ethnographic perspective there. Similarly, Dr. Harka Gurung, Dr. Om Gurung have aided much. Bista's *People of Nepal* (1998) is another masterpiece. It explores the true pictures of Nepali people and their way of life. Similarly, various researchers have sought the knowledge in this field through dissertation.

Sociology of education was not yet institutionalized; a situation that might have been different had Karl Mannheim, the German refugee sociologist appointed in 1946 to the Institute of Education, University of London, lived longer. Upon his death, after just



one year at the Institute, no successor was appointed although W.O. Lester Smith's chair (1949-53) was designated a sociology of education chair in 1953 (Thomas, 1990, pp. 193-204). The 'new' sociology of education of the 1970s, which 'focused empirically and theoretically on wider questions of power, hierarchy, social control and cultural reproduction' (Shain and Ozga, 2001, p. 113) provided a major focus for discontent. But political bias was always a two-way process. In England, ITT personnel were widely accused of indoctrinating students and neglecting 'essential knowledge' long after the introduction of student teacher competences and predominantly school-based courses. Continued derogatory references to 'teacher training colleges' provide a subtle, but interesting, example of the 'discourse of derision' (after Ball, 1990). This former term ought to have become redundant during the 1970s when these institutions were expanded and rebranded as 'colleges of education', yet it continued to have a currency in the context of attacks on ITT, (Gillian Shepherd 1997).

The sociology of education is the study of how social institutions and forces affect educational processes and outcomes, and vice versa. By many, education is understood to be a means of overcoming handicaps, achieving greater equality and acquiring wealth and status for all (Sargent 1994). Learners may be motivated by aspirations for progress and betterment. Education is perceived as a place where children can develop according to their unique needs and potentialities. The purpose of education can be to develop every individual to their full potential. However, according to some sociologists, a key problem is that the educational needs of individuals and marginalized groups may be at odds with existing social processes, such as maintaining social stability through the reproduction of inequality. The understanding of the goals and means of educational socialization processes differs according to the sociological paradigm used, (Schofield 1999).

To be more specific on sociology of education the field emerged late 1970s A systematic sociology of education began with Émile Durkheim's work on moral education as a basis for organic solidarity and that by Max Weber, on the Chinese literati as an instrument of political control. After World War II, More focus was gained: from technological functionalism in the US, egalitarian reform of opportunity in

Europe, and human-capital theory in economics. These all implied that, education promotes social mobility. Sociological studies showed how schooling patterns reflected, rather than challenged, class stratification and racial and sexual discrimination. After the general collapse of functionalism from the late 1960s onwards, the idea of education as an unmitigated good was even more profoundly challenged. Thus, to see the relationship and the nature of interaction, both sides have to be considered- teachers' and students' behavior in and outside the class rooms, Flander (1960).

The study of the sociology of education indicates how the powerful might social institutions be on their power through curricula and how knowledge and power are legitimated in curricula. The study of the sociology of education suggests that the curriculum should be both subject to ideology critique and itself promote ideology critique in students. Researches agenda for critical theorists, then is how the curriculum perpetuates the societal status quo and how can it (and should it) promote equality in society, Schutz (1967).

In the social sciences, the dilemma of deception, as we have seen, has played an important part in experimental social psychology where subjects are not told the true nature of the experiment. Another area where it has been increasingly used in recent years is that of sociology, where researchers conceal their identities and 'con' their way into alien groups—the over covert debate (Mitchell, 1993). Covert or secret participation, then, refers to that kind of research where researchers spend an extended period of time in particular research settings, concealing the fact that they are researchers and pretending to play some other role. Bulmer (1982) notes that such methods have produced an extremely lively ongoing debate and that there are no simple and universally agreed answers to the ethical issues the method produces. Erikson (1967), for example, makes a number of points against covert research; among them, that sociologists have responsibilities to their subjects in general and that secret research can injure other people in ways that cannot be anticipated or compensated for afterwards; and that sociologists have responsibilities towards fellow-sociologists. Douglas (1976), by contrast, argues that covert observation is a necessary, useful and revealing method. The most compelling argument in favor of covert observation is that

it has produced good social science which would not have been possible without the method. It would be churlish, he adds, not to recognize that the use of covert methods has advanced our understanding of society, Bulmer (1982).

Schutz (1967) was concerned with relating Husserl's ideas to the issues of sociology and to the scientific study of social behavior. Of central concern to him was the problem of understanding the meaning structure of the world of everyday life. The origins of meaning he thus sought in the 'stream of consciousness'—basically an unbroken stream of lived experiences which have no meaning in themselves. One can only impute meaning to them retrospectively, by the process of turning back on oneself and looking at what has been going on. In other words, meaning can be accounted for in this way by the concept of reflexivity. For Schutz, the attribution of meaning reflexively is dependent on the people identifying the purpose or goal they seek, Burrell and Morgan (1979).

*Pedagogy of the Oppressed* by Freire contains at least one introduction/foreword, a preface, and four chapters. Each one concentrates on how the distribution of education is justifiable from the equality perspectives and how it is controlled by power. Initially, it explores how oppression has been justified and how it is overcome through a mutual process between the "oppressor" and the "oppressed". Examining how the balance of power between the colonizer and the colonized remains relatively stable, Freire admits that the powerless in society can be frightened of freedom. He writes, "Freedom is acquired by conquest, not by gift. It must be pursued constantly and responsibly. Freedom is not an ideal located outside of man; nor is it an idea which becomes myth. It is rather the indispensable condition for the quest for human completion." According to Freire, freedom will be the result of praxis--informed action--when a balance between theory and practice is achieved, Freire (1970).

Similarly, he examines the "banking" approach to education -- a metaphor used by Freire that suggests students are considered empty bank accounts that should remain open to deposits made by the teacher. Freire rejects the "banking" approach, claiming it results in the dehumanization of both the students and the teachers. In addition, he argues the banking approach stimulates oppressive attitudes and practices in society.

Instead, Freire advocates for a more world-mediated, mutual approach to education that considers people incomplete. According to Freire, this "authentic" approach to education must allow people to be aware of their incompleteness and strive to be more fully human. This attempt to use education as a means of consciously shaping the person and the society is called *conscientization*, a term first coined by Freire in this book, Freire (1970).

In the third chapter, he is devoted to dialogics--"the essence of education as the practice of freedom"--and dialogue. Freire argues that words involve a radical interaction between reflection and action and that true words are transformational. Dialogue requires mutual respect and cooperation to not only develop understanding, but also to change the world. "Authentic" education, according to Freire, will involve dialogue between the teacher and the student, mediated by the broader world context. He warns that the limits imposed upon both the colonizer and the colonized dehumanize everyone involved, thereby removing the ability for dialogue to occur, inevitably barring the possibility of transformation, Freire (1970).

Lastly, he comes to propose that dialogics as an instrument to free the colonized, through the use of cooperation, unity, organization and cultural synthesis (overcoming problems in society to liberate human beings). This is in contrast to anti dialogic which uses conquest, manipulation, cultural invasion, and the concept of divide and rule. Freire suggests that populist dialogue is a necessity to revolution; that impeding dialogue dehumanizes and supports the status quo. This is but one example of the dichotomies Freire identifies in the book. Others include the student-teacher dichotomy and the colonizer-colonized dichotomy, Freire (1970).

Paulo Freire contributes a philosophy of education that comes not only from the more classical approaches stemming from Plato, but also from modern Marxist and anti-colonialist thinkers. In fact, in many ways his *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* may be best read as an extension of, or reply to, Frantz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth*, which emphasized the need to provide native populations with an education which was simultaneously new and modern (rather than traditional) and anti-colonial (not simply an extension of the culture of the colonizer), Allen (1987).

Freire is best-known for his attack on what he called the "banking" concept of education, in which the student was viewed as an empty account to be filled by the teacher. Of course, this is not really new — Rousseau's conception of the child as an active learner was already a step away from tabula rasa (which is basically the same as the "banking concept"), and thinkers like John Dewey and Alfred North Whitehead were strongly critical of the transmission of mere "facts" as the goal of education. Freire's work is one of the foundations of critical pedagogy, Meighan (1997).

More challenging is Freire's strong aversion to the teacher-student dichotomy. This dichotomy is admitted in Rousseau and constrained in Dewey, but Freire comes close to insisting that it should be completely abolished. This is hard to imagine in absolute terms, since there must be some enactment of the teacher-student relationship in the parent-child relationship, but what Freire suggests is that a deep reciprocity be inserted into our notions of teacher and student. Freire wants us to think in terms of teacher-student and student-teacher; that is, a teacher who learns and a learner who teaches, as the basic roles of classroom participation, Collins (1998).

This is one of the few attempts anywhere to implement something like democracy as an educational method and not merely a goal of democratic education. Even Dewey, for whom democracy was a touchstone, did not integrate democratic practices fully into his methods, though this was in part a function of Dewey's attitudes toward individuality. In its strongest early form this kind of classroom has been criticized on the grounds that it can mask rather than overcome the teacher's authority. Freire has come into criticism. Rich Gibson has critiqued his work as a cul-de-sac, a combination of old-style socialism (wherever Freire was not) and liberal reformism (wherever Freire was). Paul Taylor, in his "Texts of Paulo Freire," comes close to calling Freire a plagiarist, while Gibson notes Freire borrows very, very heavily from Hegel's "Phenomenology." Floud, (1970).

Classroom interaction analysis covers the technique consisting of objective and systematic observation of the classroom events for the study of the teacher's classroom behavior and the process of interaction going inside the classroom. Pedagogical interaction analysis may truly be incorporated as "an instrument which is designed to

record categories of verbal interaction during, or from, recorded teaching learning sessions. It is a technique for capturing qualitative and quantitative dimensions of teacher's verbal behavior in the classroom." Dr. Satya Pal Ruhela, in his book 'Educational Technology' writes that class interaction analysis may be conveniently divided into two parts: Verbal interaction and Non-Verbal interaction. S.K. Thakur, (1992).

Flander (1960) proposes the system of an observational tool used to classify the verbal behavior of teachers, and pupils as they interact in the classroom. Flanders' instrument was designed for observing only the verbal communication in the classroom and non-verbal gestures are not taken into account.

According to Flanders 1965, various theoretical assumptions, which are basic to very idea of interaction analysis, are as follows:

1. In a normal classroom situation, it is verbal communication, which is predominant.
2. Even though the use of spoken language might be resort to non-verbal gestures in classroom, verbal behavior can be observed with higher reliability than most non-verbal behavior and also it can reasonably serve as an adequate sample of the total behavior in classroom.
3. We can normally assume that verbal statements of a teacher are consistent with his non-verbal gestures and, in fact, his total behavior. This assumption was sustained in terms of experience in Minnesota studies.
4. The teacher exerts a great deal of influence on the pupils. Pupil's behavior is affected to great extent by this type of teacher behavior exhibited..
5. The relation between students and teacher is a crucial factor in the teaching process and must be considered an important aspect of methodology.
6. It has been established that social climate is related to productivity and to the quality of interpersonal relations. It has been proved that democratic atmosphere tends to keep work of a relatively high level even in the absence of the teacher.
7. Children tend to be conscious of a warm acceptance the teacher and to express greatest fondness for the democratic teacher.

8. The role of classroom climate is crucial for the learning process.
9. The teacher-classroom verbal behavior can be observed objectively by the use of observational technique designed to ‘catch’ the natural modes of behavior, which will also permit the process of measurement with a minimum disturbance of normal activities of the group of individuals.
10. Modification of teacher classroom behavior through feedback is possible (Flanders 1963), though how much can change occur and more knowledge relating to the permanence of these changes will require further research.
11. Teacher influence is expressed primarily through verbal statements. Non-verbal acts of influence do occur, but are not recorded through interaction analysis. The reasonableness of this assumption rests upon the assertion that the quality of the non-verbal acts is similar to the verbal acts; to assess verbal influence, therefore it is adequately a sample of all influences.

These assumptions focus our attention on the verbal participation of teachers and students in teaching-process, (Flanders, 1965).

Many of the questions examined in US sociology of education today are quite grounded, practical, or policy oriented. Sociologists of education ask questions about the specifics of the US educational system, about the details of how students move through the system, and about the implications of these features for inequalities in achievement, attainment, and other outcomes. Much research in the field seeks to describe empirical relationships regarding social problems related to schooling, most often in the USA. This focus contributes detailed knowledge of the society in which many researchers and their audiences are based. It is rooted in the goal of understanding real issues and problems in education and speaking to the formation of national and state level policies pertaining to education. But in its quest for understanding US-specific schooling, the American sociology of education has lost sight of another primary goal of social research: improving and expanding theories of education to refine their explanatory power. Critics of this current state of affairs have bemoaned the narrowness of the field (Meyer quoted in Bromley 2010) and its apparent lack of “concern for theory testing or the accumulation of propositional knowledge about

schooling and society” (Brint 2009:13). Because many recent analyses in the sociology of education have been “conceptually shallow and empirically incremental; few have made a major contribution to our understanding of the role of today’s schools in a rapidly changing global society” (Gallagher 1963:1).



## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The 'Methodology' in general, refers to the procedure on which the data is processed, interpreted and explained. This unit deals with design of research, significance of study, sampling procedure, source and nature of data analysis and limitations of study.

#### **3.1 Research Design**

This study is based on both exploratory cum descriptive research design. It tries to explore and investigate interactional status of two schools of the study area, Chautara VDC of Sindhupalchok district. This research attempts to explore the factors and realities regarding the teacher pupil interaction. This research also utilizes both descriptive as well as analytical designs. It means that the interpretation has been supported by tabular analysis followed by their explanations.

#### **3.2 Rationale for Selection of Study Area**

Most of the researches are concerned with the area of common interests. It seems that due attention is paid for the topics which might otherwise be significant. Keeping this fact in mind, this dissertation has been prepared to seek the new knowledge on this area. It hopefully addresses the multi-faced areas of interest.

Study of institutions that co-relate sociology is a fertile area of study. However, only numerable researches have been carried out in this topic. No doubt, school is an institution where ample of interactions take place. It is the place where socialization takes place. Children from various religious, economic backgrounds gather and bring about interaction each other. Commonly, power is exercised at school. In prehistoric days, teachers used to be regarded as a power exercises who dominated the instruction. However, in modern days, teaching has been regarded as to be child friendly. It is to be as per the need and interest. The core element in learning is the role of students. Thus, whether or not the interaction takes place could be a common interest of researchers. Therefore, from social perspective, the study is scheduled to be carried out.

### **3.3 Universe and Selection of Sample**

There were 110 schools in the district by the time this data was collected. Of them, Chautara VDC comprises of four secondary and five primary schools. Among them, three were private and five were public ones. From those, a private and a public have been selected by simple random sampling method-lottery. The number remained twenty from each school hopefully because it could represent the universe. Between these two schools, five teachers of five different subjects have been selected. They are compulsory subjects: English, Mathematics, Nepali, Science and Social Studies. So the number of teacher becomes ten five from each school. Similarly, twenty students from each school are sampled from simple random sampling method, i.e. lottery. So the total number of students becomes forty and teachers become ten. Over all the population becomes fifty.

### **3.4. Source and Nature of Data Collection**

Mostly, this research has utilized the primary source of data collection. The researcher has visited to the field and taken an interview of ten teachers. On the other hand, he has distributed the questionnaire to students and has collected data. Additionally, he has observed the schools with check list and also taken necessary information from the head teachers, guardians and others who lay keen interest on education, like local leaders, researchers. Then the processing of the data has gone ahead.

#### **3.4.1 Primary Sources of Data**

As primary sources, the researcher has visited teachers and has taken their interview. Questionnaires distributed to students are another source. He also has taken some advice and suggestions from local people with interest of education. Additionally, he has also taken an interview with guardians, in person, members of school management committee, Resource Person (RP), school supervisor, members of District Education Committee (DEC) Village Education Committee (VEC), local child clubs, unions of teachers, District Education Officer (DEO) in person. He has asked the experienced

teachers about the trend of interaction in the past and the changes they have encountered so far.

### **3.4.2 Secondary Sources of Data**

Besides meeting people and observing what remains there on the study site, the researcher also has consulted local news papers, FMs, TV and school journals etc. He has visited to the District Education Office for school statistics. He has consulted the projection of population by Central Bureau of Statistics for collection of data.

### **3.5 Method of Data Collection**

The researcher has directly been involved on study area with check list. He has taken an interview with teachers. For that, he has prepared structured questions for interview with a few rooms for impromptu questions. For students, questionnaire has been distributed. After collection these data, he has coded, decoded, analyzed and interpreted the data collected.

#### **3.5.1. Analysis and Presentation of Data**

The researcher has explained sources of data in a descriptive and analytical procedure under various sub-topics and with few tables for numerical interpretations followed by its explanations.

### **3.6 Limitations of Study**

All study and researches possesses some limitation. A single study for certain purposes may not be universalized and explained. This study is carried out for partial fulfillment of master's degree accomplishment. Therefore, this study will be limited to certain schools' of Chautara VDC. It only focuses on tenth grader of those two schools and teachers of those selected schools.

This research may/may not represent the students/teachers of advanced city area and underdeveloped villages of the country. It is limited to the response of ten teachers and forty students only. The researcher is bound to their response. Data for the study are collected with limited tolls: interview, questionnaires and observation checklist. He has

analyzed the data collected from them only. It doesn't represent all students and teachers and the way they interact. With limited resource, time and area, the wide area of student teacher interaction under the broad heading 'Sociology of Education' is studied. Therefore, it can't be able to represent the tough area of human behavior. However, the researcher attempted to minimize limitations and tried to make his research more generalizable. The data collected here at present might not be same in the days to come. Similarly, the research can not have gone beyond verbal interaction between students and teachers. As symptoms of socio- economic and political changes are apparently visible now, the data collected is bound to alter with them. Most importantly, this analysis is related to what data is generated from the sampled population. Had they concealed to provide the data or had given inaccurate data; It might not have been what it would have been supposed to. Therefore, it can't remain all the same as this data is generated. It is, thus, limited to our purpose of studying verbal interaction by means of using language between students and teachers.

## CHAPTER IV

### STUDY SITE, TEACHERS, STUDENTS AND PARENTS

#### 4.1 Introduction to Study Site

The study of Nepal and Nepalese community is a vast majority where we can sink ourselves in. It is because of the diversified Nepalese geography and varied socio-economic status of people. Equally, it is multicultural as well. All these verifications are our properties. Nepalese people glorify with all these verifications because unity in diversity is at the heart of Nepali people.

According to census (2011) the total population of Nepal is 2, 64, 94,504; of this 51.50% are female and 48.50% are male. The total literacy rate of the country is 65.90%. Among those literate, 75.1% comprises of males and 57.4% of females, (2012 Central Bureau of Statistics).

This research has been carried out in Sindhupalchok district. It is located at latitude of 27°36" to 28°13" north and at longitude of 85°27" to 86°06" east. It occupies the area of 2,542 sq.km. It lies at 85 km north east of Kathmandu valley. In the east of this district lie Dolakha and Ramechhap. Similarly, Nuwakot and Rasuwa districts are in the west. In the north of this district, autonomous region of china, Tibet is located, and Kabhrepalanchok, Kathmandu and Ramechhap are located in the south. Two famous rivers viz the Sunakoshi and the indrawati are also originated from this district, (Nepal 2060).

Geographically, the Jyugal Mountain, the closet mountain from the Kathmandu valley, is located in this district. Panch Pokhari and Helambu are also located in this district. Main trade areas of this district are Barhabishe, Tatopani, Jalbire, Melamchi, Khadichour etc. It is also famous for religious glory. The Gaurati Bhimeshwor temple is located in this district. Lamtang national park is also located in this district. Many rare animals are found in this park.

The headquarters of this district is Chautara. It is named so because once it had been an inn for Tibetan pilgrims. Even Nepali farmers used to go to Tibet to collect salt and other things of domestic use and for business purpose. During their journey they used Chautara for their transportation point. They took a rest there; hence it is named Chautara, like an inn.

There are about 110 schools in this districts which run grade 1 to 10. This VDC comprises of four secondary schools; of them two are Private and two are public. The researcher will study 50% of the universe, i.e. a public and a private school.

## **4.2 Educational Status of the Study Site**

The history of education of Sindhupalchok district traced back to the establishment of the Ratna Ganga Vidhyashram in 2004 BS. (1947 AD). This school is in the north east part of the district headquarters. The same school is now named as Shree Krishna Ratna Ganga Hicher Secondary School. The same is the sampled school for the researcher. The other sampled school is Ekata Boarding school, which was established in 2050 BS.

### **4.2.1 Distribution of Teachers**

Although Sindhupalchok district lies geographically close to the capital city of the country, Kathmandu valley, it is a bit further than there from educational perspectives. People tell that most of educated people have migrated to the Capital city or trading areas like Banepa, Dhulikhel Panouti or Panchkhal of neighboring district Kabhrepalanchok. Most of the teachers working here are not of the local VDCs; rather they are from other various districts. Teachers even from the far eastern districts to the western have been involved in teaching those schools. Let us see the geographical distribution of teachers in the tabular form.

*Table 1: Distribution of Respondent Teachers by Geography*

S.N.	Native District of Teachers		Subjects of Teaching	Gender	
	Public School	Private School		Public	Private
1.	Dhankuta	Chitwan	English	M	M
2.	Sindhupalchok	Sindhupalchok	Mathematics	M	M
3.	Bara	Janakpur	Science	M	M
4.	Sindhupalchok	Sunsari	Nepali	M	F
5.	Kabhrepalanchok	Chitwan	Social Studies	M	M

*Sources: Field Survey, 2012.*

The table No. 1 shows that English teacher of a public school is native to Dhankuta and private one is from Chitwan. Similarly, Mathematics teachers are from the same district in both schools. Science teachers are from the Terai region from Bara and Janakpur. Nepali teacher of the public school is native but of the private school is from Sunsari. Social studies teacher of the public school is from Kabhrepalanchok and private one is from Chitwan. Three teachers are from the domestic district. It could possibly reflect the shortage of manpower or their unwillingness to teaching.

Surprisingly, among ten teachers sampled, only one is female. All others are males. This reality satires the slogan of equal opportunity on education to female and male.

#### **4.2.2 Qualifications of Teachers**

As for the educational act (2028 with the latest amendments), all the teachers are mandatorily qualified. In fact, a mandatory qualification for secondary (9-10) teachers is bachelor's degree in related subject. However, when SSRP comes into effect fully by 2015, it will no doubt, be Masters degree. It is because the proposed secondary level

will be grades 9-12. Therefore, by the year 2015 AD, all secondary level teachers will have gained their minimum qualification, Masters Degree.

The following table shows the subject wise qualifications of the teachers.

*Table 2: Distribution of Respondent teachers by their Qualifications*

SN	Subjects of Teaching	Qualifications		Trainings
		Public	Private	
1.	English	M.Ed	MA/ B.Ed.	Taken
2.	Mathematics	MA/ B.Ed.	BA	Taken
3.	Science	B.Sc	B.Sc	Taken
4.	Nepali	M.Ed	MA/ B.Ed.	Taken
5.	Social Studies	MA/ M.Ed.	MA/ B.Ed.	Taken

*Sources: Field Survey, 2012.*

According to the table No.2, all subject teachers possess the bachelors' degree. Except science teachers, everyone is qualified up to Masters Degree. All teachers have taken trainings, too. The nature of their training is Pre service one. NCED has stated that study of the faculty of Education is regarded to be equivalent to pre service training.

### **4.3 Age of the Students Sampled for Study**

According to Educational Act (2028), mandatory age for secondary level students, grade 9-10 is fourteen. To appear in the SLC examination, a student has to be 14 years completer. The study of these two schools explores the age of students as follows:



*Table 3: Distribution of Respondent Students by their Age*

SN	Age	Student Respondents			Percentage		
		Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total
1.	14-15	1	2	3	5	10	7.5
2.	16-17	14	13	27	70	65	67.5
3.	18-19	4	3	7	20	15	17.5
4.	20-21	1	2	3	5	10	7.5
Total		20	20	40	100	100	100

*Sources: Field Survey, 2012.*

The table No.3 shows that only a few students comprises of the age limit of 20- 21, i.e. one each. The highest numbers of respondent students are of 16- 17 years of age. The total number indicates 67.5 in percentage. The age between 18- 19 are seven in number. The minimum age bar for SLC completers, i.e. 14-15 comprises of three students as 20- 21 years students.

#### **4.4 Ethnic Background of Students**

Most of the students of the school catchment area are Janjatis. At the heart of the district headquarters, Newar community is densely populated. Around its sides, Chhetris, Brahmans etc. also found existing. Others are Tamangs, Gurungs, Ghales, Bramhans, Chhetris etc. So Called Dalits like Kamis, Damais, Sharkis etc. also reside in the area. Consequently, students from these all communities are admitted here. Additionally, job holders district headquarters base offices, NGO/INGOs, teachers, lecturers etc. also have their children admitted there. Some guardians from remote parts of the district have rented the room at the headquarters for the purpose of getting their children admitted to the schools. This category is high in private school than in the public school.

The following table shows the ethnic background of the sampled students.

*Table 4: Distribution of Respondent Students by Ethnicity*

S.N.	Ethnicity	Number			Percentage
		Public	Private	Total	
1.	Brahman	4	2	6	15
2.	Chhetri	1	3	4	10
3.	Newar	6	3	9	22.5
4.	Tamang	4	1	5	12.5
5.	Ghale	2	0	2	5
6.	Gurung	1	0	1	2.5
7.	Kami	3	0	3	7.5
8.	Damai	4	0	4	10
9.	Sharki	2	0	2	5
10.	Others	3	1	4	10
	Total	28	12	40	100

*Sources: Field Survey, 2012.*

The table shows that Newar comprises the highest number of students- 22.5%. Secondly, Brahmans are 15%, Tamangs are 12.5% , and Chhetri, Damai and others comprises of 10% each. Kami seems 7.5%, Ghale and Sharki are 5% each and the lowest number is of Gurung, which is only of 2.5%. The participation of so called Dalits is deplorable. It seems that they can't afford their children's fees in private schools. They don't have even single participation in private schools. We can say that the equal opportunity of education is beyond the real ground. It might be so because of the faith won by private schools than public one.

## 4.5 Linguistic Background of Students

As most of the students are of the ethnic group, their mother tongue is also of their relatedness. Almost all Tamang students use Tamang language as their native language, but not all Newar students use Newari as their native language. They speak Nepali. Rests of the respondent students speak Nepali as their native language and language of classroom.

Let us see the following table about the mother tongue of respondent students.

*Table 5: Distribution of Respondent Students by Language*

S.N.	Mother Tongue	Number of respondent Students			Percentage
		Public	Private	Total	
1.	Nepali	10	14	24	60
2.	Tamang	5	5	9	22.5
3.	Newari	4	1	5	12.5
4.	Others	1	1	2	5
	Total	20	20	40	100

*Sources: Field Survey, 2012.*

In fact, the highest number of students (60%), use Nepali as their native language. Secondly, 22.5% students use Tamang language. Only 12.5% students have native language as Newari language. Although, there are nine Newar students, only five of them respond that they speak Newari other four responded that they don't. Lastly, 5% students speak other languages, not mentioned in the table. These language user students study there because of their parent's job transfer there.

## 4.6 Parents' Qualifications

Parents' education plays a vital role on children's performance. Leaving some exception, educated parents are comparatively more anxious to their children's

betterment. It is reflected in the form of frequent visit at schools, timely interactions with teachers about their children’s activities and frequent domestic counseling and guidance. Comparatively, most of the uneducated guardians are deprived of these things. Therefore, a qualification of guardians is one of the major factors that affect learners’ creativeness.

The following table shows the qualifications of teachers both in private and public schools. The table represents the highest qualifications of the guardians have gained, be it of father or of mother.

*Table 6: Parents’ Qualifications*

S.N.	Fathers’/Mothers’ Qualification	Number of Parents			Percentage
		Public	Private	Total	
1.	Illiterate	5	0	5	12.5
2.	Merely Literate	3	2	5	12.5
3.	Grade 5 Completers	3	2	5	12.5
4.	Grade 8 Completers	4	2	6	15
5.	Grade 10 Completers	2	3	5	12.5
6.	Intermediate Completers	2	2	4	10
7.	Bachelors Completers	1	3	4	10
8.	Masters Completers	0	5	5	12.5
9.	Doctorate Completers	0	1	1	2.5
	Total	20	20	40	100

*Sources: Field Survey, 2012.*

The table No. 6 shows that the highest percentage of guardians (17.5%) comprises of illiterate guardians, of them only one is from a private school. Masters and doctorate completers are nil in a public school. Conversely, illiterate guardians are nil in a private school. No guardians from the public school exceed their qualification more than bachelor's degree. In fact, this table shows that educated guardians lose the faith of the public school, since most of their children are in the English medium private boarding school. This shows that the schools have poles apart of differences on qualifications of the guardians.

## CHAPTER V

### INTERACTION BETWEEN STUDENTS AND TEACHERS

A major part of the broad field of sociology of education is interaction between students and teachers. The researcher has attempted to study it at Chautara VDC of Sindhupalchok. He has incorporated both teachers and students perspectives of interactions.

#### 5.1 Teachers Perspectives of Interactions

Interaction in the class room is a form of communication between two parties: teachers and students. Teachers play not less than fifty percent vitality in interaction and so do students. Therefore, true analysis is possible from both the perspectives. Hence, the researcher has analyzed a private and a public schools' teachers; total ten, five each.

According to their response on who initiates the interaction, the following points have been observed:

- a) Nepali language teachers seem to initiate interactions with a couple of questions in the class.
- b) English teachers of public school face language problem with poor performances of students.
- c) More often science teachers of both the schools begin and terminate with much TTT. Students have less time to talk.
- d) Mathematics teachers often seem to be busy with writing with writing on the board but provide relatively less time on interaction.
- e) Social teachers let students speak much. They provide feedback during teaching.

A couple of teachers deny interaction to take place. They tell that it is harmful because it's difficult to control the large classes. Additionally, students also dominate teachers if they are given time to speak. They also say that it's difficult to allocate the time to let them speak by respecting each individual's time on interactive contribution. English

teacher of a private teachers shows that no/ less interaction because of poor proficiency on language by students.

Let’s see the teachers’ perception on interaction as per frequency. The following table shows how often the interaction takes place. It means, for example, a teacher asks, “Have you done your homework?” And students respond, “Yes/No”. This is termed as an exchange. An exchange, therefore, could be an individual or of the group.

*Table 7: Frequency of Interaction*

<b>S.N.</b>	<b>Frequency of Interaction</b>	<b>No. of Teachers</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1.	20-25 Exchanges per Period	1	10
2.	15-20 Exchanges per Period	2	20
3.	10-15 Exchanges per Period	2	20
4.	5-10 Exchanges per Period	3	30
5.	0-5 Exchanges per Period	2	20
	Total	10	100

*Sources: Field Survey, 2012.*

According to the table No.7, the highest number of teachers, i.e. 30% interact with their students 10 to 15 times per period. 20 % teachers each interact 15-20 and 10-15 times per period. 10% each teachers interact 0-5, 5-10 and 20-25 times per period. Therefore, enough Interaction takes place with students.

## **5.2 Students Perspectives of Interactions**

Among forty respondent students- 20each from a public and a private school, everybody responded that interaction has been taking place between themselves and teachers. Most of the students responded that they love more interactions on outside issues rather than the subject matter. They could be happy to talk on games like world cup, cricket, and excursion, dance ECA etc. Some students responded that they want to

listen to their teachers talk about love affairs, telling jokes or any funny riddles. These are their areas of interest during interactions.

Students responded that they do not like interactions when teachers reprimand them or give a long speech on hating their hairstyles or dress up. Of course, criticism of providing feedback seems one of the major types of issue on interaction between students and teachers. In such type of interaction students listen much teachers speak much. The exercise of the power is also visible there. Let us see the table that shows the relationship between best teachers and the way they do interactions with them:

*Table 8: Indicators of Best Teachers According to Students*

S.N.	Reason for Best Teacher	Number			Percentage
		Public	Private	Total	
1.	Welcomes Questions	3	2	5	12.5
2.	Encourages to Speak	3	4	7	17.5
3.	Tells Jokes	5	6	11	27.5
4.	Uses much Materials	1	1	2	5
5.	Provides Prizes	2	4	6	15
6.	Doesn't Scold	3	4	7	17.5
7.	Instructs in Games	3	0	3	7.5
	Total	20	20	40	100

*Sources: Field Survey, 2012.*

The table No.8 shows that sampled students' best teacher is one who interact with jokes. 27.5% students responded on that line. 17.5% each responded that their best teacher should encourage them to speak and never rebuke them. Thirdly, 15% students like teachers who provide them prizes. 12.5% students responded that they like those teachers who welcome questions when raised. Lastly, 5% each respondents responded that they conceive their best teachers on the basis of the use of materials instructions



given in the games. From this fact, we can generalize that most of the students enjoy interactions beyond the subject matter.

Interaction is also attempted to compare with the performance of students. Let us see the following table.

*Table 9: Comparison of Students Frequency of Interaction and their Result*

S.N.	Frequency of Interaction	Average Percentage on Last Test	
		Public	Private
1.	20-25 Times per Period	82	90
2.	15-20 Times per Period	80	86
3.	10-15 Times per Period	75	70
4.	5-10 Times per Period	64	65
5.	0-5 Times per Period	43	50
6.	0 times per period	35	39

*Sources: Field Survey, 2012.*

The above mentioned table No. 9 represents that students having 20-25 interactions or discussion per period with the teacher has the highest average score in the last test, i.e. 82% and 90% respectively in public and private school respectively. Similarly, 80% and 85% of average score is seen to those students who have 15-20 times interactions per period on average. Those who interact 10-20 times per period have 75% and 70% of average score on the test taken recently. But having no interaction with teachers shows their performance failed. Those students as found in observation seem lazy, do not contribute in group command and seem slothful to perform what is required to do in the class as class work. The more interaction a student is involved on, the better their performance is seen.

### **5.3 Venue of Interactions**

A teacher pupil interaction is not just confined to the class rooms. It can be observed in different places as well. It is because they encounter in other venues, too. According to interviews, questionnaires, and check list observations, the followings have been found about the venue of their interactions.

#### **5.3.1 Interactions inside School Premises**

Students remain at list six hours or more inside the school premises. As observed a public school starts from ten and the private at nine. Both of them are closed at four. The later one has one more hour school time. Hence, schools are one of the reliable and major venues of interactions. In the staff room, students come up with some problems to see mathematics, science and English teachers. The staff room thus becomes the venue of interactions. Besides they interact in the assembly, play ground, canteen, corridor, office, accountants' room, library, computer lab, science lab, Student club's rooms, hostel (in the case of private school's students) school garden etc. all these venues remain the areas of interactions.

#### **5.3.2 Interactions outside School Premises**

Major areas of interactions outside school premises are found to be coaching, tuition classes or halls owned by teachers. A significant no. of students has been observed to have interaction in Tudnikhel, a big play ground of Chautara. Others meet and interact at temples markets, community learning centers, an inn bus park, teachers' rooms/homes and other social gatherings. They also interact at picnic, tour, child club's meetings etc.

#### **5.3.3 Interactions with e-technology**

Besides the face to face meet in and outside the school wings, a heavy amount of interactions have taken place in each others absence. It is made possible by the help of e-technology. Students use phones (mollies, PSTN, CDMA etc) to interact. Around 80% of students of private school and around 37% of public students possess cell phones. However both the schools prohibit students to bring those phones inside the

school premises. They interact from outside the schools to their teachers. More than 50% students have an access to the internet. They interact with the use of email and various other social networks like facebook, twiter etc.

## **CHAPTER VI**

### **CHANGES IN STUDENTS TEACHERS INTERACTION**

As the time passes by, human norms values and behaviors also changes with the pace of time. Social interaction is one of the major components of society. As society alters, no doubt, agents and measures of interactions amend with it.

#### **6.1 Traditional Belief of Interaction**

Historically, teaching was conceived as unilateral phenomenon. As the teacher ordered, commanded, instructed so was to be followed by students. There was no or little provision of raising questions from students' parts. Thus, an interaction on subject matter used to be almost impossible. Those who dared to raise questions before the teacher either could be punished or if lucky reprimanded. Most of the respondent teachers mentioned that similar was the case when they were schooled. Students were supposed to memorize the lessons and teachers ordered to recite. Students told whatever they were told to do so. Hardly a couple of exchanges took place. Interaction used to be under hegemony. No teaching materials, no group discussion, no pair work, no demonstrations, consequently on enough interaction at all.

However, with international and domestic changes on educational believes, sea change came in student teacher interaction. No longer have students suppressed their feelings at their heart. Now they seem to have freedom, at list to raise some inquiries before their teachers.

#### **6.2 Interaction at Present**

Educationists have attempted to put forward that learning ensures easily when learners are active. To activate them, ample amount of interaction is what is required. As already mentioned review of literature, Flander came up with new concept of class room interaction. Gradually, with the implementation of NESP(1971-1976), domestic educational policy got changed. Definitely, it assisted to change in interaction, too. The core document of (EFA 2009-2015) also ensures learner friendly education on mother

tongue. In sampled schools, teachers have been giving enough environment for interactions to students, yet not sufficient.

According to responses of teachers and students, Resource Persons (RP), School Inspectors, District Education Officers (DEO) and other local people with interest on education interaction at present is characterized by following features:

- a) When teachers enter inside the class room, students stand up and greet their teachers and teachers respond to their greeting and tell them to take their seats. This becomes an initial exchange of an interaction inside the class rooms.
- b) Teachers ask individual and or group questions to students, which they need to answer or respond by standing up. This demands their verbal response that takes the shape of interaction for our purpose.
- c) Mostly, students don't fear to put queries as a form of interaction with their teachers, normally when the teacher gives them time to ask. Rather, when the teacher remains in his time to talk on, he/ she don't like students' interruption to occur.
- d) Teachers respond that they love interaction mostly when students seem prompt, but when they are seen slothful, teachers don't want to contribute by initiating interaction.
- e) Parents have become relatively more conscious to children's' performance. Particularly, guardians of students with better result on test encourage their children to communicate with teachers. Thus they respond that they have been facilitating their children by telling them to interact.

### **6.3 Factors Affecting Changes on Interaction**

Among total 50 respondents (10 teachers and 40 students), various factors have been mentioned by them as changing agents of teacher pupil interactions. These are responses of teachers, students and observations of the researcher, too. It is also contributed from local educators, district education officer etc. To tabulate their responses in unified way looks like this.

*Table 10: Changing Agents on Students Teachers Interaction*

S.N.	Changing Agents	Respondents			Percentage
		Teachers	Students	Total	
1.	Teachers Behavior	1	5	6	12
2.	Students Behavior	1	9	10	20
3.	Nature of Subject	0	4	4	8
4.	Political Changes	1	4	5	10
5.	Trainings	5	6	11	22
6.	School Environment	1	5	6	12
7.	Child Right	0	5	5	10
8.	Others	1	2	3	6
	Total	10	40	50	100

*Sources: Field Survey, 2012.*

The above table No.10 shows that the highest respondents, 22% mentioned the cause of change in interaction is training to the teacher. Secondly, Students' behavior is regarded as a major factor in change of interaction by 20% respondents. Similarly, school environment was regarded changing factor by 12% respondents. Political changes and child rights receive 19% each and lastly, nature of subject and others receive 8% and 10% respectively. From this data, we can generalize that providing training to teachers results in change in interaction.

Of course these various changing factors influence the change in interaction. Besides, this national policy of education is another root cause of interaction. Similarly e-technology also helps to change the nature of interaction.

#### **6.4 Challenges of Interaction**

Teacher pupil interaction is not absent from challenges. Various variables affect it. The researcher has mentioned them under three broad headings.

### **6.4 .1 Teachers Related Challenges**

This broad heading consists of various sub components. Firstly, ‘power’ plays a vital role. A teacher is conceived as a powerful authority. His hegemony, therefore, makes students fear to dare questions before teacher. Secondly, per occupied schema about teacher plays another fundamental role. Students’ parents faced the traditional role relationship with their teachers. They rouse fear to students and tell not to speak much with teachers, obey their commands and the same reflects at school as challenge of interaction. Thirdly, some teachers are found not to having interaction because thy want to be ‘strict’ don’t want students to dominate them. This belief has remained another challenge. Lastly, but not less importantly, teachers’ own unwillingness or their own inability to handle class during interaction, like - as interaction reaches at an apex, teachers order students to ‘ keep quiet’ - is also major cause of challenge in interaction. Although, 100% of the sampled teachers are trained, still a few of them seem not using their training during interaction. They use teacher centered method of interaction. Consequently, it is teachers who decide to initiate/ terminate interaction. Rather than making class noisy or ‘chatting’ with students in the calls, teachers are found to have been controlling the interaction. This is still a significant challenge in the field of educational interaction.

### **6.4 .2 Students Related Challenges**

Students are one of the two components of teacher pupil interaction. Initially students did not dare to raise questions before a teacher because he used to be considered as a powerful authority. Secondly, lack of knowledge on subject matter on the part of students is another challenge. If students don’t know what is being taught, there is no question of interaction to take pace. Because of poor linguistic performance, mostly in English language classes of public school, students participate less in interaction. Additionally, secondary level students are psychologically at the period of rapid growth and development. Hormonal imbalances hinder them to interact. Girls have their menstruation begin. Due to these changes, they develop physical discomforts like fatigue, fear anxiety etc. Ultimately, the interaction gets disturbed.

### **6.4 .3 Other Challenges**

Besides teachers/ students related issues there are various other challenges interactions. Firstly, the nature of subject matter or lessons determines interactions. For example, while teaching writing exercises, less or no interaction takes place. Physical infrastructure of the school, buildings or class rooms aid challenges in the interactions. For example metal roofed buildings disturb spattering rain with poor listening ability. Schools near roads factory disturbs interactions. Both sampled schools remain close to road. Various disturbances are found like the movement of vehicles and their blow of horn. Timely processions of political parties also found disturbed there. In the private school, roofs are made of metal. They disturb during rain or heat. Most importantly, timely strikes by various sister organizations of political parties or other groups make schools close and no interaction takes place.



## CHAPTER VII

### SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMENDATIOS

#### 7.1 Summary

This thesis has been prepared at Chautara VDC of Sindhupalchok district as its study site. It lies around 80km north east from the capital city, Kathmandu. This dissertation takes its theoretical base on broad heading Sociology of Education, which is narrowed down to interaction between students and teachers. Interaction, here, is represented as a form of communication between students and teachers at social institution, i.e. school.

Educational activities can not be conducted at vacuum. It takes its shape only as an essential component of a society. There come different variables linked each other. Teachers, students and guardians are three pillars of an educative process. Presence or absence of one is introspective to the presence of absence of the other two. All these three hover around in society in the form of social interaction. By now, a heap of researches have conducted on broad social issues, yet countable in the fields of sociology of education. Keeping this fact in mind, this research has been carried out about teacher pupil interaction in two schools- a public and a private one.

The research aims at exploring the present condition of teacher pupil interaction and to evaluate the changing variables on this issue. It is significant broadly onto two bases- theoretical and practical one. The former may aid on knowledge by providing theoretical base, and later on applied fields like teaching, trainings, curriculum designing, teaching materials development etc.

It has been separated into seven different chapters, beginning from introduction to this conclusion.

For research venue, the researcher has sampled two schools, a public and a private one of the hilly region, Chautara VDC of Sindhupalchok district. Five teachers who teach compulsory subjects have been sampled from both schools. Twenty students and five teachers from each school have been sampled total study respondents numbered 50.

Three procedures of Collection of data are **a)** taking interview with teachers, **b)** filling questionnaires from students and **c)** Check list observation from the researcher himself. Additionally, DEO, DDC, RC etc. also provide useful and authentic data. They are analyzed in the descriptive procedure. However, it is based on limited data at a particular place and time only.

All sampled teachers possess Masters Degree as their qualification. They are trained and experienced. Interaction takes place in all classes but the frequency varies on the basis of subject matter, nature of lessons, issues raised etc.

Educational level of the guardians is very low at Chautara. Still a significant no of guardians are found illiterate. Most of the educated guardians get their children admitted at the private schools. Relatively, guardians of public school have fewer qualifications than those of private ones.

Most of the students are from indigenous ethnic background. The highest number of the sampled students are found Newars and secondly Tamangs. The dominant languages used as their native language are Tamang and Newari. Because of the influences of their native languages, they show poor performance in Nepali language. Similarly, interaction seems a bit more problematic in public school in English. It is not easy enough to communicate with their teachers in English. However the same problem is not seen in private school students can easily communicate among themselves and with other teachers.

Interaction, as to be more specific, varies according to subject, lesson, nature of class etc. In mathematics, an ample amount of time is seen to have spent on written exercises less on discussion and interaction or so. Same is the case in science as well. Rather than asking some confused questions to teachers, students begin to learn the definitions by heart, especially on science subject. These two subjects get less time from the perspectives of interaction.

What so ever, significant amount of time is spent on interaction in the class and outside. On average, around 15 exchanges take place between students and teachers per period.

These exchanges include greeting, simple verbal commands and all. It seems that all students don't get equal and independent time in interaction.

The frequency of interaction is seen directly proportional to their performance in the test. The more they interact with teachers better their result seems to.

Some teachers deny allocating time on interaction because it is difficult carry on large classes. Mostly, teachers from the public school say that the class becomes 'noisy' and 'uncontrolled' due to interaction.

Most of the students like interaction to take place. But they like interaction be on other issues than the subject matter. When interaction takes place on telling jokes, or other informal issue, students are found happy with it. On the contrary, when interaction is on subject matter or lesson or on criticizing them on their habit, get up, or so, students seem fed up with that.

Respondent students were given to mention their best teacher on the questionnaire. Everyone responded on that issue. The reason behind choosing their best teacher was the way he/she interacts in the class. Best teacher of most of the students is one who tells the joke. Similarly, their best teacher doesn't rebuke them.

According to responses, interaction takes place in various venues. Much interaction takes place inside the school premises. Sometimes, interaction is also possible at coaching classes, play ground, an inn, teacher's room, tour and other social gatherings.

Interaction seems to be full of challenges. They are categorized under three broad headings: teachers/ students related and other challenges. From teachers' side interaction is hard to manage in large classes. Students interest on informal issues rather than subject matter is another challenge. Others like- strikes, physical infrastructures, political interferences, school management committees' biasness etc. are other challenges.

Most important of all, however is the fact that school administration, guardians, students and teachers be together, these challenges of interactions could be wept out.

## 7.2 Conclusions

School is regarded as one of the social organizations. It is the venue for different people to socialize or to interact. Therefore, a true analysis of teacher pupil interaction is proper analysis of society. Social analysis remains incomplete if schools are kept away. Keeping this fact in mind, this study has been carried out. From this study, following conclusions are drawn.

- A) Chautara VDC is still back in educational perspective because most of guardians are illiterate of having minimum academic degrees, hard enough for everyday life to sustain.
- B) Enough interaction takes place between students and teachers; neither more nor less.
- C) Some teachers don't like interaction because they fear of noises and controlling large classes.
- D) Students like to interact with teachers on outer issues rather than subject matter. They love interaction at library, science/ Computer labs. When interaction depicts their weaknesses, like scolding, criticizing, nagging on their domestic tasks, etc, they don't contribute or hate those issues to be discussed as interactions.
- E) Those students, who frequently take part on interaction in the class, have better performance in the previous test result.
- F) Students hate interaction especially when teachers talk directly on abstract ideas of subject matters.
- G) Students' perception on best teacher is one who tells jokes and or raises informal issues to discuss, not the boring subject matters.
- H) Interaction takes place in different venues: inside school premises and outside.
- I) Maximum thirty exchanges take place per period as the frequency. Some students don't contribute in interaction.
- J) Nature and frequency of interaction varies according to subject, class, lesson etc. Some lessons demand much more interactions on Social Studies subject.

- K)** Students- pupil interaction has been facing various challenges. Broadly, they are categorized under the broad headings related to students, teachers and others.
- L)** Interaction is made easier when teachers are informal, flexible and make fun with students. On the contrary, if teachers are not so, they hate interactional environment.
- M)** National and international factors contribute on change of interaction. Of them, national policy of education, environment of schools, Child Right issues, raise of democracy etc. are major ones. Interaction at present is better than before. No longer have students feared with teachers; teachers also give enough chance to speak students that ensures better form of interaction. However, still, hegemonic symptoms are seen.
- N)** Schools were found getting disturbed by political parties. They should not be the venue for political parties to exercise their movement. They should be peace zones in practice not just on papers.

### **7.3 Recommendations**

By systematically analyzing the teacher pupil interaction, various conclusions are drawn. Taking the base on those conclusions, following recommendations can be made to get interaction be better.

- A)** As the literacy of the VDC is low, firstly literacy Campion has to be carried out. Or else its effectiveness has to be monitored, evaluated and supervised so that adult literacy is ensured.
- B)** Some teachers mentioned that it is hard to manage interactions in the large classes. Classes have to be reduced and sections have to be managed. Necessary physical infrastructures have to be set up by concerned authority.
- C)** ‘Manipulative’ interaction technique has to be conducted so that students make a fun during interaction and learning becomes easier.
- D)** Students hate teachers’ interaction when teachers criticize them. Thus proper counseling, guidance and enough positive talk is required to make feel interaction beneficial to students.

- E)** Interaction takes place both in and outside the class room. When it takes place outside both encoder and decoder get disturbed by noises, other students and teachers. When it takes place inside the staff room, other teachers might be disturbed. To avoid these disturbances, student interaction hall has to be set up.
- F)** Although many students have an access to mobile phones, internet, a significant number of students are beyond these facilities. It is, therefore, better if schools can set up computer lab to insure the interactions.
- G)** Various challenges lie under the factor affecting interaction. Political dilemma of the country has affected schools' smooth running which ultimately affects interaction. Thus, political influences have to be nullified.
- H)** Teachers have to be provided to an opportunity to refresher's trainings, so that they can be conscious of child friendly learning and handling interactions in large classes.
- I)** Guardians have to be made aware with the fact that asking questions with teachers is not taboo. Also, they have to be made conscious on the fact that a teacher is not just an authority; we can share feelings and exchange ideas and can have an ample amount of interaction with them.
- J)** Students with much interaction with teachers exhibit better performance in test. Those who don't expose interaction seem poor in exams. Thus, to improve educational standard, those back warded students have to be encouraged for interaction. Those students should be provided an opportunity to speak.
- K)** Load shedding (power cut) has disturbed much in interaction in coaching/ tuition classes. Thus, if light is managed, much interaction can be ensured.
- L)** Guardians have to be made conscious to their children's domestic as well as school activities. They have to be made aware of the fact that the more they remain close to their teachers for interactions, the more they wipe out their confusion regarding to subject matter. Therefore, guardians have to be educated that interaction is better medicine to overcome confusion rather than the demand of punishment from teachers to their children.

# APPENDIX

## Nature of Interaction between Students and Teachers: A study of Secondary Level Students and Teachers of Chautara VDC of Sindhupalchok.

### A Research Question to Interview for Teachers

by

Kushal Dev Ghimire

Central Department of Sociology/ Anthropology, TU, Kirtipur.

- A) How long have you been teaching?
  - so far?
  - in this school?
- B) Do you enjoy teaching?
- C) What makes you feel teaching so interesting/ disgusting? Mention any five.
- D) Have you been involved on in service/ pre service training? If so, how long was it?
- E) Do you think that/ those training(s) help(s) you in your teaching?
- F) Are they useful in class room interaction between you and your students?
- G) What percent of your students passed in last test taken?
- H) Who speaks much in your class, yourself or your students?
- I) Do you assign group discussion or not? Why/ Why not?
- J) How often do you let your students interact with you?
- K) Do students ask you questions without hesitation or do they fear to do so?
- L) Do students bother you asking much and much questions?
- M) How do you respond to a student who asks you questions so frequently?
  - i) Who speak frequently?
  - ii) Who don't speak?
  - iii) Why so?
- N) Do all students speak with you during lesson?
- O) How do you manage to provide the chance to speak equally?
- P) Do you punish your students? How and in which situation?
- Q) Do you entertain the informal questions outside the class, like in the office, play ground, at the school yard?
- R) How do your colleagues react when children ask some questions outside?
- S) Remember your schooling age. Are there any differences between the way you interact with your teacher and at present yourself as a teacher?
- T) If so mention any three differences.

- U) What do you think are major causes of those changes?
- V) How do you think should a good teacher respond to his/ her students' queries?
- W) There used to be a trend that closeness between students and teacher results on domination of teachers by students. What do you think of that?
- X) Could you please tell me anything that is relevant on interaction between students and teacher?
- Y) Anything more pertinent on this issue?

**Thank you for your cooperation!**



# **Nature of Interaction between Students and Teachers: A study of Secondary Level Students and Teachers of Chautara VDC of Sindhupalchok.**

## **Research Questionnaires for Students**

by

Kushal Dev Ghimire

Central Department of Sociology/ Anthropology, TU, Kirtipur.

Please answer these questions about class interaction between you and your teachers. It is for research purpose. All or no part of it could be revealed so as the form is filled by YOU. It is and will be confidential. Fill free to omit any part of it.

Name:-

Age:-

Name of your school:-

Interest:-

Class:-

Answer these questions. Use ball pen or pen, not pencil.

- A) When did you join this school?
- B) What subject do you like most in this school?
- C) Who is your best teacher? Why?
- D) How often do you interact with your best teacher?
- E) Besides meeting your teachers in person do you interact your teachers with the use of e-technology? What technology do you use?
- F) Do you ask some questions to your teacher in the class?
- G) How often do you ask questions per period?
- H) Does your teacher entertain/ discourage questions?
- I) Do you meet to discuss with your teacher outside the class or not?
- J) If you do where do you meet?
- K) Have you ever been to the excursion tour?
- L) Did you ask your teacher about the places of your visit in the tour?
- M) Did teacher respond to you queries you put?
- N) What subject matter do you like during interaction?
- O) What subject matter do you dislike during interaction?
- P) Do your teachers punish you? If so How often? And When?
- Q) What are basic child rights? Mention any three related to school.
- R) Do you have children's club here?
- S) Do your teachers help you on activities of club, Extra Curricular Activities (ECA) etc. with some suggestions?

- T) Who conducts the ECA activity in your school?
- U) Do teachers communicate with you during those activities?
- V) What is the maximum qualification of your guardians?
- W) Do your parents visit your school? Why?
- X) Do they communicate with you and your teachers?
- Y) Is there anything that you want to mention about the issue of student teacher interaction?

**Thank you for your cooperation!**

## **Nature of Interaction between Students and Teachers: A study of Secondary Level Students and Teachers of Chautara VDC of Sindhupalchok.**

Kushal Dev Ghimire

Central Department of Sociology/ Anthropology, TU, Kirtipur.

### **Observation Check List for the Researcher himself**

Name of school:-

A)	Is the class room learner friendly?	Yes	No
B)	Are the physical facilities of the school good?	Yes	No
C)	Are teaching materials decorated in the class?	Yes	No
D)	Do students greet the teachers?	Yes	No
E)	Do teachers respond to students greeting?	Yes	No
F)	Are students curious to learning?	Yes	No
G)	Do they put some questions to teachers?	Yes	No
H)	Do teachers entertain students' questions?	Yes	No
I)	Do teachers create the situations to make students speak?	Yes	No
J)	Do students speak one by one by waiting for their turn?	Yes	No
K)	Are teachers inquisitive to teaching?	Yes	No
L)	Are students inquisitive to interaction?	Yes	No
M)	Is the punishment used in the class or outside?	Yes	No
N)	Do students meet their teachers outside the class?	Yes	No
O)	Do teachers interact among students guardians and themselves together?	Yes	No
P)	Does interaction take place more than ten times?	Yes	No

## A DISSERTATION ENTITLED

### Nature of Interaction between Students and Teachers: A Study of Secondary Level Schools of Chautara VDC of Sindhupalchok

Kushal Dev Ghimir

Sindhupalchok in Nepal



Chautara in Sindhupalchok

**A) General Background and Objectives of the Study:** - Education has often been seen as a fundamentally optimistic human endeavor characterized by aspirations for progress and betterment. It is understood by many to be a means of overcoming handicaps, achieving greater equality and acquiring wealth and social status. It, therefore, assures the quality life.

From social perspective, education refers to the play ground where we all encounter to play the role of a player of a social creature. School, thus, is a fundamental component of a society. It is also invariably a venue where communication among members of a society takes place. The study of such communication as a form of an interaction is all this dissertation is about. To be more specific, it attempts to seek these objectives:

1. Exploration of the present condition of interaction between students and teachers both in and outside the classroom of Chautara VDC of Sindhupalchok and
2. Assessing the causes of change in student teacher interaction.

**B) What it's Significance is:** - The study is significant broadly on two major areas- theoretical and practical. As far as the former is concerned, it hopefully aids in the theory on the nature of teacher pupil interaction. Secondly, it assists to teaching practitioners, curriculum designers as well as teaching materials developers and even to guardians too. To be precise, this research could be an important document for studying teacher pupil interaction in future whoever want to study it.

**C) How the Study is organized:** - It contains seven different chapters: introduction, review of related literature, research methodology, analysis and interpretation, teachers' and students' perspective cum venue of interaction, challenges and summary, conclusion and recommendation.

**D) Research Methodology:** - It is descriptive, yet utilizes some tabular and percentile representation.

**E) Why the area is selected:** - It is geographically multivariable, ranging from the snow falling Himalayan to Hilly and low land as well. Various ethnic and culturally varied people choose to stay there. Although it is merely 80km from Kathmandu valley, it seems to be lack of educated manpower. Most of the teachers are non native of the district, literacy is poor, and

segregation on education is highly privileged between public and private schools.

- F) **Universe, Sample and Sampling Procedure:** - From among 110 schools of the district, stratified sampling is utilized and a private and a public school have been selected. From these two schools, five teachers of five different subjects have been selected. They are compulsory subjects: English, Mathematics, Nepali, Science and Social Studies. So the number of teacher becomes ten, five from each school. Similarly, twenty students from each school are sampled from simple random sampling method, i.e. lottery. So the total number of students becomes forty and teachers become ten. Over all the population becomes fifty.
- G) **How the Data is Collected and analyzed:** - As the primary source of data, the researcher collects with checklist, he has also taken an interview with students, teachers, guardians, in person, members of school management committee, Resource Person (RP), school supervisor, members of District Education Committee (DEC) Village Education Committee (VEP), local child clubs, unions of teachers, District Education Officer (DEO) in person. Broadly, the research utilizes interview from teachers, questionnaires for students and checklist from the researcher himself. The researcher also has consulted local news papers, FMs, TV and school journals etc. He has visited to the District Education Office for school statistics. He has consulted the projection of population by Central Bureau of Statistics for collection of data.
- H) **What the limitation of the study is:** - This study is carried out for partial fulfillment of master's degree accomplishment. Therefore, this study will be limited to certain schools' of Chautara VDC. It only focuses on tenth grader of those two schools and teachers of those selected schools. It is limited to the response of ten teachers and forty students only. The researcher is bound to their response. Data for the study are collected with limited tolls: interview, questionnaires and observation checklist and few other journals and magazines.
- I) **What conclusion is:** - These conclusions have been drawn from the study.
- A) Chautara VDC is still back in educational perspective because most of guardians are illiterate of having minimum academic degrees, hard enough for everyday life to sustain.
- B) Enough interaction takes place between students and teachers; neither more nor less.
- C) Some teachers don't like interaction because they fear of noises and controlling large classes.
- D) Students like to interact with teachers on outer issues rather than subject matter. They love interaction at library, science/ Computer labs. When interaction depicts their weaknesses, like scolding, criticizing, nagging

- on their domestic tasks, etc, they don't contribute or hate those issues to be discussed as interactions.
- E)** Those students, who frequently take part on interaction in the class, have better performance in the previous test result.
  - F)** Students hate interaction specially when teachers talk directly on abstract ideas of subject matters.
  - G)** Students' perception on best teacher is one who tells jokes and or raises informal issues to discuss, not the boring subject matters.
  - H)** Interaction takes place in different venues: inside school premises and outside.
  - I)** Maximum thirty exchanges take place per period as the frequency. Some students don't contribute in interaction.
  - J)** Nature and frequency of interaction varies according to subject, class, lesson etc. Some lessons demand much more interactions on Social Studies subject.
  - K)** Students- pupil interaction has been facing various challenges. Broadly, they are categorized under the broad headings related to students, teachers and others.
  - L)** Interaction is made easier when teachers are informal, flexible and make fun with students. On the contrary, if teachers are not so, they hate interactional environment.
  - M)** National and international factors contribute on change of interaction. Of them, national policy of education, environment of schools, Child Right issues, raise of democracy etc. are major ones. Interaction at present is better than before. No longer have students feared with teachers; teachers also give enough chance to speak students that ensures better form of interaction. However, still, hegemonic symptoms are seen.

Thank YOU so much!

Kushal Dev Ghimire

## **REFERENCES**

- Allen, B. (1987) *Foundations of Education*, Cambridge University press, US.
- Bales, J. (1950). *Nature of Teacher Pupil Interaction* Harvard University press, UK.

Bernstein, B. (1974) *Sociology and the Sociology of Education: A Brief Account.* In J.Rex (ed.) *Approaches to Sociology: an Introduction to Major Trends in British Sociology.* OUP, London.

Block, A.A., (1997) *I'm only Bleeding, Education as the Practice of Violence Against Children,* Peter Lang, New York.

Blummer, J. (1982) *Social Perspectives of Education,* Harvard University Press, UK.

Bourdieu, P. (1990) *Reproduction: In Education, Society and Culture,* Sage Publications, London.

Bourdieu, P. ([1983] 1986) *The Forms of Capital,* Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. New York.

Brint, M. (2009) *Research on Sociology of Education,* Peter Lang, New York.

Collins, R. (1998). *The sociology of Philosophies (A Global Theory of Intellectual Change).* Harvard University press, UK.

Dorothy H. (1996) *Education in Nepal: Problems, Reform and Social Change.* OUP, London.

Floud, J., Halsey, A. H. and Martin, F. (1956) *Social Class and Educational Opportunity:* Heinemann.

Gabbard, D and Saltman, K. (eds) (2003) *Education as Enforcement: The Militarization and Corporatization of Schooling* OUP, London.

Gallaghe, M. and Aschner, G. (1963) *Factors Affecting Interaction between Students and Teachers,* Penguin, UK.

Gautam, L. D. (2006) *Ethnographic Study of Ghale Community of Sindhupalchok, Chautara* (A Dissertation)

Gorder, K., (1980) “Understanding School Knowledge: a Critical Appraisal of Basil Bernstein and Pierre Bourdieu” Sage Publications, London.

Gordon M. (1998) A Dictionary of Sociology Oxford University Press, UK.

Hallinan, T.M.(2011, Edit.) Frontiers in Sociology of Education. Springer.

Hargens, L. and Warren O. (1982) “Scientific Consensus and Academic Status Attainment Patterns of Sociology of Education 40:24–38.

Harper, G. (1997) Society, Culture, Socialization and the Individual Macmillan Education Australia, Melbourne.

Lamont, M. (1987). How to Become a Dominant French Philosopher: The Case of Jacques Derrida. American Journal of Sociology 93:584–622.

Lampert, K.,(2003) Prolegomena for Radical Schooling University Press of A, Marryland.

Meighan, R. & Siraj-Blatchford, I. (1997) A Sociology of Educating (3rd Ed), Cassell, London.

Nepal, S. (2006) Nepal Bhitraiko Sindhupalchok, Dukhi Press Sindhupalchok.

Paulo Freire, (1970) Pedagogy of the Oppressed ,Continuum Press, New York.

Rich G. (2006.)The Frozen Dialectics of Paulo Freire, in NeoLiberalism and Education Reform, Hampton Press.

Ritzer, G. and Smart, B. ( 2011, Edit.). Handbook of Social theory. Sage publications, London.

Sargent, M. (1994) The New Sociology for Australians (3rd Ed), Longman Chesire, Melbourne



Schofield, K. (1999) "The Purposes of Education", in Queensland State Education: 2010 (Conference Papers).

Spring, J., (2000) Deculturalization and the Struggle for Equality: A brief History of the Education of Dominant Cultures in the U.S. US McGraw Hill.

Young, J. (2000) Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education, Macmillan, London.

[www.sociologyofeducation.com/research](http://www.sociologyofeducation.com/research). Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.